



**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

**Application No.:** 10/063,236  
**Applicant:** Webber  
**Confirmation No.:** 5209  
**Filed:** April 2, 2002  
**Group Art Unit:** 2873  
**Examiner:** Martinez, Joseph P.  
  
**Attorney Docket No.:** H-317  
**Customer No.:** 26245

Cambridge, Massachusetts  
December 2, 2005

**RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION**

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the non-final Office Action issued August 2, 2005 in connection with the above application, the following arguments are submitted; there are no amendments to the description, claims or drawings.

Claims 1-28 are pending in the application. No claim is allowed, and no claim is objected to. All claims stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Albert et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,017,584.

The 35 USC 103(a) is traversed. More specifically, this rejection is traversed on the grounds that Albert does not describe the use of a polymer having a number average molecular weight in excess of about 20,000, the polymer being essentially non-absorbing on the [electrophoretic] particles, dissolved or dispersed in the suspending fluid of an electrophoretic medium.

The Office Action states that Albert teaches an electrophoretic medium comprising a plurality of particles (15) suspended in a suspending fluid (17), the particles being capable of moving through the fluid on application of an electric field to the